

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-62 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/18/11 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. The applicant argues Rigaldies fails to disclose a third entity involved with the synchronization, but the examiner fails to see how the applicant has properly responded to the examiner's assertion and citations that Rigaldies discloses three-way synchronization between the workstation mailbox, the e-mail message store, and the voice-mail message store.

Any changes made by the user's workstation mailbox are replicated to the voice-mail server and synchronization between the voice-mail server and the e-mail server also occur (Abstract; Fig. 1-4; Col. 10, ln. 1-8; Col. 15, ln. 59 – Col. 16, ln. 6). For example, Rigaldies discloses that the voice-mail message store on the voice-mail server synchronizes with the client to obtain all voice-mail and e-mail (Abstract, "the voice-mail message store contains both the voice-mail and e-mail; Fig. 1-4) and that the e-mail message store on the e-mail server may also contain all voice-mail and e-mail (Abstract, "the e-mail message store contains both the e-mail and the voice-mail; Fig. 1-4). Therefore, synchronization is occurring between the workstation mailbox, the e-mail message store, and the voice-mail message store. Additionally, any mail sent from the mail server to the client may be seen as replication between two devices, and then synchronization of the client's mail with the voice-mail server is synchronization with a third device (Abstract; Fig. 1-4).

5. The applicant argues equating temporary copies of mail items with maintaining a copy of an application database is improper. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Oberhaus discloses that the mobile device mail server stores and then handles the "delivery" of mail to the mobile device (Col. 3, ln. 28-54). The local mail server performs the same for the desktop computer (Col. 3, ln. 28-54). If the mail is delivered to the mobile device and the desktop computer, it may be interpreted as being stored, at least temporarily. Additionally, in order

to view email on a display at the desktop computer or mobile device, the mail must be stored locally in temporary memory, such as the random-access memory disclosed by Oberhaus (Col. 24, ln. 3-12).

6. The applicant argues the claim has been amended to clarify the synchronization request comes from a user computing device as opposed to a client computing device. The examiner respectfully fails to see how this language changes the scope of the claim. A user computing device and a client computing device would appear to be equivalent. Oberhaus's teachings suggest the mail synch "client" is a user device as indicated by the language of the reference (Oberhaus: Abstract, ln. 1-5, "the user is able to effectively see and interact with only a single 'virtual' mailbox, which is the synchronized combination of two different electronic mailboxes"; Col. 2, ln. 26-46; Col. 3, ln. 28-54; Col. 8, ln. 57-58). Furthermore, the mail synch is stated to be local to the mail user (Oberhaus: Col. 3, ln. 49-54).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-2, 5, 8-11, 14, 17-20, 23, 26-34, 37, 39-43, 46, 49-53, 56, and 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigaldies et al. (Rigaldies), U.S. Patent No. 6,792,085 B1, in view of Oberhaus et al. (Oberhaus), U.S. Patent No. 6,983,308 B1.

9. As to claim 1, Rigaldies discloses a computer implemented method, comprising:  
by a mail server, receiving information from a first computing device regarding every change made to an application database located on the first computing device (Abstract; Col. 4, ln. 29-35 and 41-60; Col. 22, ln. 21-23; the client, e-mail server and voice-mail all have respective databases in the form of workstation mailbox, e-mail message store, and voice-mail message store respectively; Fig. 6; Col. 13, ln. 43-60; Col. 15, ln. 44-58; Col. 19, ln. 40-57; on-going synchronization occurs via the agent notifying the voice-mail server of any new status of a message);

by the mail server, storing the information in a mail folder on the mail server, the mail folder corresponding to a user associated with the first computing device and a second computing device (Abstract; Fig. 1-4; Col. 10, ln. 1-8; Col. 15, ln. 59 – Col. 16, ln. 6; the workstation mailbox is replicated/synchronized to the voice-mail server, the voice-mail server inherently includes a mailbox representing the user to accomplish said

replication/synchronization) maintaining a copy of the application database (Abstract; Col. 4, ln. 29-35 and 41-60; Col. 22, ln. 21-23; the client, e-mail server and voice-mail all have respective databases in the form of workstation mailbox, e-mail message store, and voice-mail message store respectively; Fig. 6; Col. 13, ln. 43-60; Col. 15, ln. 44-58; Col. 19, ln. 40-57; on-going synchronization occurs via the agent notifying the voice-mail server of any new status of a message); and

forwarding, by the mail server, the information from the mail folder to the second computing device (Fig. 2; Col. 12, ln. 14-43).

Rigaldies is silent on the synchronization being done between the mail server and a first and second *user* computing device;

by the mail server, receiving a synchronization request from the second user computing device and

responsive to the synchronization request, forwarding the information.

However, Oberhaus discloses synchronization (in a manner similar to that disclosed by Rigaldies) between a mail server and a first and second *user* computing device (Abstract, ln. 1-5; Col. 2, ln. 26-46; Col. 3, ln. 28-54; Col. 8, ln. 57-58);

by the mail server, receiving a synchronization request from the second user computing device (Abstract, ln. 1-5; Col. 2, ln. 26-46; Col. 3, ln. 28-54; Col. 8, ln. 57-58) and

responsive to the synchronization request, forwarding the information (Abstract, ln. 1-5; Col. 2, ln. 26-46; Col. 3, ln. 28-54; Col. 8, ln. 57-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rigaldies in the aforementioned manner as taught by Oberhaus in order to enable multiple mailboxes of a user to be synchronized and provide a single “virtual” mailbox (Oberhaus: Col. 1, ln. 56-61) for ease of viewing.

10. As to claim 2, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein the information includes a record for each change made to the application database since said last synchronization (Rigaldies: Col. 18, ln. 31-39; Col. 18, ln. 61 – Col. 19, ln. 23).

11. As to claim 5, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 2, wherein the record for each change includes an identification of the record (Rigaldies: Col. 18, ln. 20-39; Col. 18, ln. 61 – Col. 19, ln. 23; Col. 19, ln. 40-57).

12. As to claim 8, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, further comprising:

deleting the information from said mail folder after said forwarding (Rigaldies: Col. 18, ln. 31-39).

13. As to claims 9, 18, 27, 29, 31, 33, 41, 51, and 60-62, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.

14. As to claim 10, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, wherein the uploading occurs in response to a request for synchronization on the first user computing device (Rigaldies: Fig. 2).

15. As to claim 11, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, wherein the downloading occurs in response to a request for synchronization on the second user computing device (Rigaldies: Col. 4, ln. 41-60; Col. 12, ln. 14-43).

16. As to claims 14, 23, 37, 46, and 56, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 5 above.

17. As to claims 17, 26, 28, 30, 32, 39-40, 49-50, and 59, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 8 above.

18. As to claims 19, 42, and 52, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 10 above.

19. As to claims 20, 43, and 53, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 11 above.

20. As to claim 34, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 2 above.

21. Claims 3, 12, 21, 35, 44, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rigaldies and Oberhaus as applied to claims 2, 9, 18, 34, 41, and 51 above, in view of Christie et al. (Christie), U.S. Patent No. 5,757,669.

22. As to claim 3, Rigaldies may be interpreted as inherently disclosing the record for each change includes an identification of the computing device where the change took place as discussed in reference to parent claim 2 (Col. 18, ln. 31-39; Col. 18, ln. 61 – Col. 19, ln. 23). This is due to the fact that Rigaldies discloses synchronization between a single workstation and a single mobile phone. As a consequence, the user must know that any status change synchronization on one device is occurring to a change made by the other device (Abstract;

Col. 4, ln. 29-35 and 41-60). However, Rigaldies does not explicitly disclose that a record is kept of the device identifiers related to changes.

However, Christie does explicitly disclose the record for each change includes an identification of the user computing device where the change took place (Col. 3, ln. 47-49). Identification of a device responsible for changes in a networking environment is extremely well known in the networking and database management arts. Networking and database management rely heavily on the identification of devices responsible for actions, in order to facilitate management and communication between devices.

The benefit of identifying the device responsible for a change in Christie is facilitating message forum communication (Col. 3, ln. 26-35). The entity responsible for the creation of a message is vital in message forums.

This benefit is also of use in Rigaldies' environment. Electronic mail and voice messages are sent and received by a user. It is crucial that a record is kept by the identity of message senders. Additionally, a benefit of device identity being stored would be that each user computing device (the mobile phone and workstation) in Rigaldies' environment could thus ensure that the end user is responsible for changes being made and that changes on messages are not coming from a hostile outside user. Thus both network communication and network security are benefits of identifying the creating entity in regards to electronic messages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rigaldies and Oberhaus by storing the identity of a user computing device responsible for a change in a change record as taught by Christie in order to facilitate network communications and network security as discussed above.

23. As to claims 12, 21, 35, 44, and 54, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 3 above.

24. Claims 4, 6, 13, 15, 22, 24, 36, 38, 45, 47, 55, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigaldies and Oberhaus as applied to claims 2, 9, 18, 34, 41, and 51 above, in view of LaRue et al. (LaRue), U.S. Patent No. 6,449,622 B1.

25. As to claim 4, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 2, including a record for each change used to synchronize with the mail server (Rigaldies: Col. 18, ln. 31-39; Col. 18, ln. 61 – Col. 19, ln. 23), but is silent on the record for each change includes a time stamp indicating the time the record is synchronized with the server.

However, LaRue discloses the record for each change includes a time stamp indicating the time the record is synchronized with the server (Col. 32, ln. 24-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rigaldies and Oberhaus by recording a time stamp indicating the last time a record was synchronized with a server as taught by LaRue in order to compare change times between the server and the user in order to ensure that records are not obsolete (LaRue: Col. 32, ln. 24-37).

26. As to claims 6, 13, 15, 22, 24, 36, 38, 45, 47, 55, and 57, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 4 above.

27. Claims 7, 16, 25, 48, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rigaldies and Oberhaus as applied to claims 2, 9, 18, 41, and 51, in view of Malik, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065892 A1.

28. As to claim 7, Rigaldies and Oberhaus disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 2, including a record for each change associated with a change-action-queue record (Rigaldies: Col. 18, ln. 31-39; Col. 18, ln. 61 – Col. 19, ln. 23), but is silent on the record for each change includes a location and identify of attachment documents.

However, Malik discloses the record for each change includes a location and identify of attachment documents ([0026] – [0028]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Rigaldies and Oberhaus by including a location and identify of attachment documents in a record as taught by Malik in order to minimize the amount of duplicate copies of an identical attachment stored in a mail store (Malik: [0020]).

29. As to claims 16, 25, 48, and 58, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 7 above.

***Conclusion***

30. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until

after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple  
/B. P. W./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2448  
8/18/11

/FIRMIN BACKER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2448